

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are independent.

The examiner uses Ellis to reject claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-22 and 24 as having been anticipated.

Claims 1, 9, and 17, as amended, recite "the computing device having a second display to concurrently display an Electronic Programming Guide (EPG) corresponding to the video broadcast and received from said receiving system and the video broadcast," or similar language. Ellis fails to disclose or describe at least this quoted claim feature.

Ellis discloses displaying only an EPG on a remote program guide access device. Accordingly, claims 1, 9 and 17 are not anticipated by Ellis.

The examiner uses Ellis and Elliot to reject claims 6, 14 and 22 as having been obvious.

Claims 1, 9, and 17, as amended, recite "the computing device having a second display to concurrently display an Electronic Programming Guide (EPG) corresponding to the video broadcast and received from said receiving system and the video broadcast," or similar language. As discussed above, Ellis fails to teach or suggest at least this quoted claim feature. Elliot fails to provide for this deficiency in Ellis.

Elliot teaches a mobile switching center intranet function:

The present invention installs an IP intranet functionality in a Mobile Switching Center for supporting wireless data and multimedia services within an operator community of interest. An IP network is introduced between a multimedia device and the Internet. The intranet provides a subnetwork and service context for wireless telco operators. Upon initiation of a service session by a multimedia terminal, the Mobile Switching Center presents the subscriber with the operator "intranet homepage" that serves as the primary navigator and launch pad for traversing the operator intranet or for launching a session on the Internet. If the initiating device is a voice only terminal, the Mobile Switching Center enables connection to another voice only terminal as usual. (Elliot, col. 4, lines 48-60)

This is very different from the computing device having a second display to concurrently display an Electronic Programming Guide (EPG) corresponding to the video broadcast and received from said receiving system and the video broadcast. Combining Ellis and Elliot produces a

display of an EPG on a wireless phone via a wireless switch. Accordingly, claims 1, 9 and 17 are not obvious in view of Ellis and Elliot, whether taken separately or in combination.

Claims 6, 14 and 22 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claims 1, 9 and 17. Accordingly, claims 6, 14 and 22 are not obvious in view of Ellis and Elliot, whether taken separately or in combination.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 17, 2006


Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Holland & Knight LLP
10 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116
Telephone: (617) 573-5879
Facsimile: (617) 523-6850

3592971_v1